

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 05-330824 (Egami) in view of U.S. 5,082,811 (Bruno). The Office Action states that Egami teaches a method of hydrothermally producing barium titanate particles, but fails to teach coating the barium titanate particles. The Office Action also states that Bruno teaches coating barium titanate particles and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to coat the barium titanate particles taught by Egami with the metal oxide coating taught by Bruno in order to enhance the dielectric properties of the barium titanate particles.

The cited references Egami and Bruno, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed method which includes the step of maintaining the barium titanate-based particles in a wet environment after hydrothermally producing the particles and prior to forming a coating on surfaces of the particles, amongst others. The proposed combination of Egami and Bruno does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, the requirements of a prima facie case of obviousness are not met, and claim 1 is patentable over the Egami and Bruno combination. Dependent claims 2-4 and 8 depend from claim 1 and, thus, are patentable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection on this ground.

Claims 4-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Egami in view of Bruno as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. 4,764,493 (Lilley). Claims 4-5 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over the combination of Egami and Bruno as described above. Lilley does not overcome the deficiency of the Egami and Bruno combination with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Lilley does not teach the step of maintaining the barium titanate based particles in a wet environment prior to coating. Therefore, claims 4-5 are patentable over the combination of Egami in view of Bruno and further in view of Lilley for at least this reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection on this ground.

Claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Egami in view of Bruno as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. 5,833,361 (Funk). Claims 7-8 depend from claim 1. Funk does not overcome the deficiency of the Egami and Bruno combination with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Funk does not teach the step of maintaining the barium titanate based particles in a wet environment prior to coating. Therefore, claims 7-8 are patentable over the combination of Egami in view of Bruno and further in view of Funk for at

least this reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection on this ground.

Newly added claim 10 depends from claim 1 and is also patentable over the cited references for at least the above-described reason that claim 1 is patentable.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully disagree that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine any of the cited references in the manners stated in the Office Action. Claims 1-10 are also patentable over the cited references for this reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing Amendments and Remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to the undersigned, Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted

By: 

Robert H. Walat, Reg. No. 46,324
Peter C. Lando, Reg. No. 34,654
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211
Tel. No.: (617) 720-3500
Attorney for Applicant

Docket No.: C00698/70138
Date: March 4, 2002
x03/4/02x